UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/490,772	01/24/2000	Reinhard Heinrich Hohensee	IBMN.004US01 (0511)	7611

7590 11/17/2005

Chambliss, Bahner & Stophel, P.C.
1000 Tallan Building
Two Union Square
Chattanooga, TN 37402

EXAMINER	
PARK, CHAN S	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2622	

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/490,772	HOHENSEE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CHAN S. PARK	2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *01 September 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-18 and 44-68* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-18 and 44-68* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's Appeal Brief was received on 9/1/05, and has been entered and made of record. Currently, **claims 1-18 and 44-68** are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. In view of the appeal brief filed on 3/15/05, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED.

New grounds of rejections are set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 13-15, 44-47, 50-52, 54, 55, 58, 59, 67 and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Irons et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,427,032 (hereinafter Irons).

3. With respect to claim 13, Irons teaches a method for managing presentation objects for multiple use (col. 20, lines 27-30), comprising:

downloading to a printer (110 in fig. 1) a presentation object identified in a print data stream (col. 21, lines 36-52);

caching the presentation object in a cache of the printer when the presentation object is downloaded (cache is an inherent feature in a network printer for the printing process); and

capturing the presentation object in memory of the printer (image index database 228 used for the printing) if a globally-unique identifier has been assigned to the presentation object (col. 15, lines 24-48).

4. With respect to claim 14, Irons teaches the method of claim 13, wherein the memory comprises permanent storage (image index database 228).

5. With respect to claim 15, Irons teaches the method of claim 13 further comprising deleting previously captured objects to increase available capture storage area in the memory (col. 12, lines 3-12).

6. With respect to claim 44, Irons discloses a system for managing presentation objects for multiple use, comprising:

a printer cache (cache is an inherent feature in a network printer for the printing process) for caching a presentation object identified in a print data stream when downloaded (col. 21, lines 36-52); and

printer capture storage (image index database 228 used for the printing) for capturing the presentation object if a globally-unique identifier has been assigned to the presentation object (col. 15, lines 24-48).

7. With respect to claim 45, Irons discloses the system of claim 44 further comprising a print server (col. 23, lines 13-22), the print server deleting previously captured objects in the printer capture storage (col. 12, lines 3-12).

8. With respect to claim 46, Irons discloses the system of claim 44 further comprising a print server (col. 23, lines 13-22), the print server deleting previously downloaded or active objects (col. 12, lines 3-12).

9. With respect to claim 47, Irons discloses the system of 46, wherein the previously downloaded or active objects exist in the capture storage or cache storage (col. 12, lines 3-12).

10. With respect to claim 50, Irons discloses a system for processing referenced objects, comprising:

a print server (col. 23, lines 13-22) for searching for a presentation object referenced by a selected indicia in a print data stream, the selected indicia being a name, a globally-unique identifier or a globally-unique identifier and an object locator (col. 21, lines 36-52 & col. 15, line 40); and

a control unit for capturing the presentation object in persistent memory (image index database 228);

wherein the control unit determines if the presentation object is to be captured based upon whether the selected indicia includes a globally-unique identifier (col. 15, lines 24-48).

11. With respect to claim 51, Irons teaches the system of claim 50, wherein the data stream references the object by an object name and the print server searches for the object by object name (col. 15, lines 24-48).

12. With respect to claim 52, Irons teaches the system of claim 51, wherein the print server attempts to find the object resident in a presentation device when the object is referenced with a globally unique identifier (col. 20, lines 5-14).

13. With respect to claim 54, Irons teaches the system of claim 50, wherein the control unit references the object by a globally-unique identifier (col. 15, line 40).

14. With respect to claim 55, Irons teaches the system of claim 54, wherein the server attempts to find the object resident in the presentation device using a globally-unique identifier (col. 21, lines 36-52).

15. With respect to claim 58, Irons teaches the system of claim 50, wherein the data stream references the object by a globally unique identifier and an object locator (col. 21, lines 23-35).

16. With respect to claim 59, Irons teaches the system of claim 58, wherein the data stream references the object by a globally-unique identifier and an object locator (col. 11, lines 45-59).

17. With respect to claim 67, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 13, are applicable.

18. With respect to claim 68, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 15, are applicable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McLachlan et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,144,458 (hereinafter McLachlan) in view of Herriot U.S. Patent No. 6,134,583.

19. With respect to claim 1, McLachlan teaches a method for enabling re-use of presentation objects by a printing system (printer driver in conjunction with printer in fig. 1), comprising:

identifying an object in a print data stream for presentation by the printing system (col. 2, line 52 – col. 3, line 17), and

generating at the printing system an identifier for assignment to the object (col. 3, lines 43-48).

McLachlan, however, does not teach expressly that the identifier is a globally unique identifier.

Herriot, the same field of endeavor of enabling re-use of presentation objects, teaches the method of using the globally unique identifier to identify objects (col. 22, lines 49-55 & col. 23, lines 19-20).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the globally unique identifier method of Herriot into the printing system of McLachlan.

The motivation/suggestion for doing so would have been to provide a unique identifier associate to a particular object in the network environment (col. 10, lines 32-40 of Herriot).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine McLachlan with Herriot to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

20. With respect to claim 2, Herriot teaches the method, wherein the globally-unique identifier assigned to the object allows the object to be securely and correctly referenced for re-use (col. 10, lines 32-40).

21. With respect to claim 3, Herriot teaches the method, wherein the globally-unique identifier assigned to the object is platform-independent (col. 23, lines 16-18).

22. With respect to claim 4, Herriot teaches the method, wherein the globally-unique identifier is based upon an ISO administered global naming tree (col. 10, lines 41-60).

23. With respect to claim 5, Herriot teaches the method, wherein the globally-unique identifier is contained in a syntax structure of a data stream (col. 9, lines 37-44 & col. 10, lines 35-40).

24. With respect to claim 6, Herriot teaches that the document is made up of mixed object data (col. 4, lines 46-56 of Herriot). Therefore, the reference teaches the limitations of the invention as specified in claim 6.

25. With respect to claim 7, Herriot teaches the assigning a globally unique identifier further comprises:

requesting, in an ISO administered global naming tree, a first node for an application that uses the object (ISO in col. 10, lines 54-56);

registering, under the first node, a second node for each license of the application ("registration authority" in col. 10, lines 56-58); and

assigning a globally-unique identifier for the object (col. 10, lines 32-40 & col. 22, lines 47-64), the globally-unique identifier including an indication of the object, the first node and the second node (col. 10, lines 41-58).

26. With respect to claim 8, Herriot teaches the assigning a globally unique identifier further comprises generating a globally-unique identifier for an object (col. 10, lines 32-40 & col. 22, lines 47-64), the generated globally-unique identifier includes an indication of a first node representing an application that

uses the object (ISO in col. 10, lines 54-56), of a second node for each license of the application and of the object ("registration authority" in col. 10, lines 56-58).

27. With respect to claim 11, both Herriot and McLachlan do not explicitly teach the indication of object including a checksum value. However, Examiner takes Official Notice that including a checksum in a data representing the object is well known in the art.

According to the Hansen dictionary, checksum is commonly used to determine the integrity of data that has been received.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to use checksum value described in the dictionary to determine whether the data has been accurately received by the client computer of Herriot.

28. With respect to claim 12, Herriot teaches that the indication of the object includes a binary counter (col. 13, lines 19-33).

Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of McLachlan and Herriot as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Hoover et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,724,575 (hereinafter Hoover).

29. With respect to claim 9, the combination teaches the method of claim 8, but it does not teach explicitly that the indication of the object includes a time stamp wherein the time stamp includes an indication of the date and time.

Hoover, the same field of endeavor of managing the database using object identifier art, teaches the method of indicating an object using time stamp wherein the time stamp includes an indication of the date and time (col. 24, line 6 – col. 25, line 7).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the time stamp in the object identifier of McLachlan and Herriot.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide information as to when the object is updated pertaining to a particular object identifier using the time stamp method.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the three references to obtain the invention as specified in claims 9 and 10.

Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irons.

30. With respect to claims 16, 17 and 18, Irons does not teach expressly the method of deleting non-active, least recently used, largest or smallest objects first. However, as previously cited in the Office action dated 2/26/04, Examiner takes Official Notice that setting a priority based on the size of the data and deleting based on the priority set by the user is well known in the memory management art. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to set the memory management device delete

one of non-active, largest or smallest objects based on the user defined parameter to increase the availability of the memory.

Claims 48 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irons as applied to claim 46 above, and further in view of McLachlan.

31. With respect to claim 48, Irons discloses the system of claim 46, but if does not explicitly disclose a control unit for marking deleted objects in the capture storage as removable.

McLachlan, the same field of endeavor of printing art, teaches a method for identifying whether the transmitted object is never stored in a memory of a printer (fig. 2) and storing the object along with a unique identifier in the memory of the printer for re-use. Furthermore, McLachlan discloses a printer control unit for marking deleted objects in the capture storage as removable (col. 4, lines 12-15).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the deleting method of McLachlan into the system of Irons.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide a method for selecting objects to be deleted in the system of Irons for the memory management.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Irons with McLachlan to obtain the invention as specified in claim 48.

32. With respect to claim 49, McLachlan discloses the system wherein a removable object is deleted when a capture request is received to make storage available to capture a new resource (col. 4, lines 1-15).

Claim 53 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irons as applied to claim 52 above, and further in view of Matsuyama U.S. Patent No. 6,330,068.

33. With respect to claim 53, Irons discloses the system of claim 52 wherein the object is referenced from a secure environment (col. 20, lines 11-14; col. 31, lines 9-11, 55-67; & col. 32, lines 32-39). Irons, however does not disclose expressly that the print server downloads the object and the control unit captures the object when the attempt to find the resident object fails.

Matsuyama, the same field of endeavor of network printing art, discloses a print server that downloads an object and a control unit that captures the object when the attempt to find the resident object fails (col. 15, lines 39-44 and col. 19, lines 39-46).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the globally-unique object identifier of Irons with the downloading the object from other server of Matsuyama.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to use the globally-unique identifier to locate the object data stored in other servers.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Irons with Matsuyama to obtain the invention as specified in claim 53.

Claims 56 and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irons as applied to claim 55 above, and further in view of Matsuyama.

34. With respect to claim 56, Matsuyama discloses a print system wherein a print server searches for the resource inline (other print servers in network) when the search for a resident globally identifier fails (col. 15, lines 39-44 and col. 19, lines 39-46).

Arguments analogous to those presented for claim 53, are applicable.

35. With respect to claim 57, Irons discloses that the object is referenced from a secure environment (col. 20, lines 11-14; col. 31, lines 9-11, 55-67; & col. 32, lines 32-39). Arguments analogous to those presented for claim 53, are applicable.

Claims 60-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irons as applied to claim 59 above, and further in view of Matsuyama.

36. With respect to claim 60, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 53, are applicable.

37. With respect to claim 61, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 57, are applicable.

38. With respect to claim 62, Matsuyama discloses a print system wherein a print server looks for the object by object locator in a resource library (image server 102) when the inline search is unsuccessful (col. 15, lines 39-44 and col. 19, lines 39-46).

39. With respect to claim 63, Irons discloses the print server that determines whether the globally-unique identifier assigned to the object matches the globally unique identifier referenced (col. 23, lines 1-21).

40. With respect to claim 64, Irons discloses that the server downloads the object and the control unit captures the object by the globally unique identifier if the globally unique identifier assigned to the object matches the globally unique identifier referenced (col. 23, lines 1-21).

41. With respect to claim 65, Matsuyama discloses that an indication of an error is provided if the identifier assigned to the object does not match the identifier referenced (image object not found in any of the print server in col. 15, lines 29-44 and col. 19, lines 39-46).

42. With respect to claim 66, Matsuyama discloses the print server for checking whether the object contain a globally-unique identifier. Note that when the identifier is not contain in the image it assigns one the object at step S1111. Additionally, Matsuyama discloses a display for displaying system running state (col. 8, lines 33-37). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to notify the user when the object is not stored within system by analyzing the presence of the identifier.

Contact Information

43. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHAN S. PARK whose telephone number is (571) 272-7409. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Coles can be reached on (571) 272-7402. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chan S. Park
Examiner
Art Unit 2622

csp
November 10, 2005

JOSEPH R. POKRZYWA
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2622